

CLEAN VERSION

multiple compartments **(38)** located within each support member (14, 16 & 18)". It is to be noted in FIG. 1, only two drive motors **(37)** and two compartments **(38)** are shown for clarity purposes, however multiple drive motors **(37)** and multiple compartments **(38)** are included within each support member **(14, 16 & 18)**.

EXAMINERS REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

1. “The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:” Etc.
2. “Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In regard to claims 2 and 3, the term “attachment means” (line 2) is confusing whether or not this term is the same as the “attachment means” recited in the previous claim 1 (line6). If they are the same, a proper antecedent basis for each term is required (for example, “said attachment means”). If not, they should differentiate them separately.

In regard to claim 4, “said support structure” is confusing as referring to what element. Should it read, “said overhead structure” as defined in previous claim 1 (line)?

APPLICANTS REPLY

We respectfully request the Examiner to kindly reconsider the rejections as we herein provide newly written claims which reflect corrections

accordingly. For example, in the newly presented claims the noted "attachment means" now includes proper antecedent basis. Also, as noted by the Examiner "said support structure" has been changed to read "said overhead structure".

EXAMINERS REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

3. "The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:" Etc.
4. "Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent (No. 7-42297) in view of Lange (US Patent No. 4, 512,117)." Etc.

APPLICANTS REPLY

We respectfully request the Examiner to kindly reconsider the noted rejections as the applicants contend that the newly presented claims now more clearly define over the cited prior art in a manner that provides patentable material.

In view of the above, if the Examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate and/or if the Examiner (knowing that the applicants are not skilled Attorney's but are applying as a private citizens) can see areas which applicant has failed to point out and distinctly

claim but would lead to patentable material, then we respectfully request the Examiner to point out said material and to write acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j) and give the applicants an opportunity to respond further before final action.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons above, this application is now submitted to contain claims which define a novel and patentable invention. Hence allowance of the application is respectfully submitted to be proper and is respectfully solicited.

Very respectfully,


Cathy D. Santa Cruz


Gordon E. Churchward